



Full Text Provided by ERIC

COPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART

NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS-1963-A

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 079 271

SP 006 676

AUTHOR Haberman, Martin
TITLE Extremism or Equity in the Governance of Teacher Education.
PUB DATE [73]
NOTE 15p.
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Certification; College Faculty; *Governance; State Supervisors; Teacher Associations; *Teacher Certification; *Teacher Education; *Teacher Educators; *Teacher Supervision

ABSTRACT

This paper is a consideration of what would happen to teacher education programs if they were controlled exclusively by school districts, arts and science faculty, state department personnel, or classroom teachers themselves. The pressures that are exerted by each of these constituencies are discussed in terms of their potential effects on both the content and administration of approved programs in teacher education. (Author/JA)

ED 079271

NOT FOR PUBLICATION OR DISTRIBUTION WITHOUT PERMISSION

Extremism or Equity in the Governance of Teacher Education

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPY
RIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED
BY Martin Haberman
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING
UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE
OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION
OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PER-
MISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT
OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Martin Haberman, Professor
School of Education
University of Wisconsin-
Milwaukee

Who controls the planning, offering and evaluation of programs of teacher education has long been a controversial topic. For decades, the "establishment" was considered by outside critics (e.g. Rickover, Bestor, Conant, Koerner), as an axis composed of schools of education, the NEA and public school administrators. The state department personnel were also included as the handmaidens of this "establishment". But those were years of teacher shortage and strong financial support for the expansion of schools of education. Further, there was a degree of cooperation among components of the "establishment" who united against the suggestion that certification was a needless bureaucratic device aimed at keeping liberal arts types from the classroom. In truth, there was some general agreement among public school people, college faculty and state department personnel that some professional preparation and certification was a useful and necessary prerequisite for teaching.

The development of many intervening forces in the last decade makes the present criticisms of teacher education quite different from those of

former times. The public and particularly those who speak for minority groups, have extended their search for accountability to the schools of education. Public school administrators, no longer in need of teachers, are rethinking their role in teacher education. State departments, pressured by many forces, but particularly those in early childhood to certify non-college types, have become intensely responsive to performance based teacher education. College of arts and science faculty often see a new opportunity to diminish the roles of schools of education on their various campuses. But most important, the classroom teachers have become organized and are now simultaneously responsive to a variety of pressures -- job security, accountability, new feelings of militancy, and a felt need to cut down on the large numbers of new teachers seeking positions.

We have, therefore, a new set of concerns regarding the governance of teacher education.

- In former times, major critics were almost entirely outside the field of professional education; at present, they are predominantly inside the profession.

- Previously, critics attacked a common "establishment" composed of various groups of cooperating professionals; now, there is a range of criticism aimed at schools of education by various groups of former supporters.

- And most important of all, major criticisms in the past were aimed at the content of teacher education (e.g. more clinical experiences, more liberal studies, more cultural understandings, more behavioral skills, etc.); while the present criticisms deal with the locus of control; the organization, administration and the governance of the profession.

From the NEA point of view there are only two constituencies: the classroom teacher and everyone else. From my perspective, there seem to be a spectrum of groups involved in the control of teacher education. These groups should participate in governance on a cooperative basis; that is, in decision-making regarding all the stages of teacher education--from the planning of programs to the certification and follow-up of teachers in-service. For purposes of analysis, however, and to more clearly understand some of the agendas (hidden and open) of these various groups, it might be useful to think through their primary goals and perceptions.

On the basis of professional experience and no systematic data, I would venture some "predictions" about the various groups' motivations and what might happen if the control of teacher education were to be primarily under the egis of only one of the constituencies. Obviously, my intention is deal with issues in extreme terms, since no one group can control teacher education in future. If I have an agenda, it is to make people wary of any single group having complete control over what is, by definition, a cooperative enterprise.

Community Controlled Teacher Education

The basic purpose of teacher education is to prepare teachers who can 1) teach fundamental skills and basic areas of knowledge; 2) support the value system of the particular neighborhood or community where they are employed; and 3) demonstrate on an annual evaluation that pupils in their classes show "normal" progress.

There is a high level of agreement between inner city and

suburban parents that radicals or deviant thinkers are dangerous, since they would be unconcerned or ineffective regarding fundamental learnings of their pupils and stopping drugs and promiscuity among youth.

There should be parents involved in deciding who is permitted to student teach or intern in a particular school building; parents also would tend to think it desirable to have a voice in deciding who is recommended for state certification and who is ultimately hired to teach in particular schools in their community. Community members and parents also feel a need to be involved in decisions regarding who is given tenure after a period of inservice. The primary criterion of "success" in all of these areas is pupils' learning in traditional subject matter areas and a record of supporting rather than seeking to change school curriculum.

Parents and community members are also concerned with securing special personnel to perform special services, ^{teach in} exceptional education areas and provide remedial instruction. It is important to emphasize that parents and community members think in terms of particular school buildings (and even more particularly, in terms of the buildings that their children have attended), rather than in terms of a total professional need generally. One example of the effects of the parents' unit of concern being a building rather than the profession, is that they would be more responsive to the desires of future teachers who wanted to prepare to teach subjects or grades that were needed in their particular schools, more than they might support college youth in the areas of social studies, elementary education or other "oversupplied" specializations. This is, of course, the exact reverse of the present situation in which college youth are completely free to become certified teachers in areas of their own choosing with little or no control from non-college constituencies.

School District Controlled Teacher Education

Administrators and school boards are, by design, most responsive to the parents and community. Their opportunities for "leadership" cannot be too far a departure from the norm or they are subject to loss of financial support and sometimes even their positions. In essence, this means that administrators seek to represent the most powerful groups in their communities. The influences which would become paramount, therefore, if community members controlled teacher education, would prevail (and even be enhanced), if school administrators and school board members had the major voice.

In former times, the emphasis in college-school relationships was on what the schools had to offer student teachers. Schools vied for the "honor" of being selected. The older literature is epitomized by the famous Dewey essay in which he describes the student teachers' right to fail with pupils in order to experience and discover the principles of teaching--and the stupidity of observing student teachers in the process of merely practicing how to improve their lessons. More recently, the rhetoric has been on what student teachers can offer schools as well as what schools can offer to student teachers; the student teaching center concept has amplified this point of view to include sharing all the resources that schools of education can make available to schools in return for gaining the schools' cooperation in teacher education. In future, the emphasis will clearly shift to what students can actually teach pupils and to the specific skills and services that student teachers will add to the public school program. It is and will become, much less than a quid pro quo relationship. Pressured by community (and teachers' associations) and freed from a teacher shortage, more school administrators will demand student

teachers with skills already developed, in a wide range of instructional and service areas, to successfully perform these services in return for the right to student teach in their buildings. Students expect to learn during these experiences; administrators will be demanding they bring their knowledge full blown and contribute it. Students will be asked if they have already learned methods--particularly reading--and if they have had pre-student teaching experiences to develop these proficiencies.

Marginal students will be rejected; this includes low grades, peculiar appearances, or whatever the particular administrator regards as questionable. Change oriented, hip, liberal-radical types will receive even shorter shrift than formerly. Administrators, no longer in need of identifying promising beginners, will feel little predisposition to deal with students they regard as potentially inept or troublemakers. In sum, the days of conceiving of teacher education students as the vehicle for changing schools (e.g. Teacher Corps. assumptions), are over.

In those places where teacher contracts do not determine student teacher assignments, the practice of placing alert student teachers with inservice teachers for the purpose of upgrading the cooperating teacher will be done more openly and more extensively, if this group has its way. Whatever controls colleges have over the selection and conditions of serving as cooperating personnel would be diminished still further.

Administrators and boards will be willing to become more involved in other aspects of teacher education than in professional laboratory experiences. They will prove avid supporters of performance based teacher education so that beginning teachers can function in schools that will be pressured for accountability of instruction.

Urban school administrators will seek students with culturally pluralistic social and educational backgrounds. The need to have a token person of a particular background will develop into seeking a person with particular human relations and instructional skills.

School administrators have always been a force for changing teacher education into teacher training and more specifically, into training which is an orientation to their particular system. This means they would not only support changing a general methods course into a reading course, but into a series of behavioral competencies for utilizing the exact texts and other materials which teachers in their systems are required to follow. I recently observed interviews ^{program} where the applicants were asked if their college/taught them to use the Distar Method, I.T.A, or the Scott Foresman basal texts.

There will continue to be some interest in beginning teachers for their financial advantage. Obviously, administrators will be more interested in inservice than preservice decisions and most concerned about areas not covered in the teacher contracts in force in their particular districts.

Teacher Education Controlled by Arts and Science Faculty

More specific academic requirements. Professional coursework reduced to the state minimum thereby making the approved program approach disfunctional. Smaller schools of education devoted primarily to certification of individuals without academic majors, inservice and advanced programs. Certification by departments; foreign language, music, etc. dealing directly with state departments rather a college

certifying officer.

Selection of students into programs by faculty/student committees primarily on the traditional criteria; grades, selected required courses. No quotas or specific emphases that reflect the needs (or lack of need) for particular kinds of teachers. Little responsiveness to classroom teachers, school administrators, community, children, or youth. No direct experiences supervised by college faculty; clinical professors, teaching assistants and public school personnel will fulfill these roles. Student teaching requirements will be stated in the number of hours to be completed rather than in behavioral competencies.

There will be great program diversity reflecting these various subject matter disciplines. There will be "some" innovativeness as political scientists, philosophers, theater arts people get involved in programs. Essentially, this would become a source of students and tuition for departments who do not have access to them now; the additional resources would not be invested in improving teacher education per se, but in improving graduate studies in the particular disciplines.

State Department Controlled Teacher Education

First, all applicants will be thoroughly checked to see that they meet statutory requirements; now, on the approved program basis, many colleges "fudge" in these areas. There would be a strong tendency to move back from approved programs -- comprised of traditional courses -- to dealing with the actual state department codes. Presently, faculty in colleges frequently "forget" there is supposed to be a unit in a course that deals with the history of the state, or consumer cooperatives, or the evils of alcohol. If state departments controlled teacher education

they would first need to reassure themselves that all statutes were really being adhered to. This is the result of the direct supervision often exercised by state legislatures over departments of public instruction, which colleges now feel only indirectly and on a watered down basis.

Second, the state departments would be concerned with areas of need throughout the state, more than they would emphasize students' free choice of certification programs. In remote rural areas, in urban ghettos, and in particular subjects and grades, there are statewide needs which they would seek to recruit for.

Third, state departments would be most receptive to certification programs based on behavioral competencies--provided of course, other agencies (preferably college-school consortia) did the work of staffing and administering the checkout machinery.

In many ways, state departments are free of the financial pressures now being exerted on schools of education and accountability pressures being placed on classroom teachers. They may have little staff or other resources; this makes them very responsive to clerical and bureaucratic concerns. (e.g. How to check large numbers of transcripts? How to check large pools of behavioral competencies? How to oversee diverse and numerous programs? How to enforce state laws?) Their far-reaching responsibilities, with limited staffing, make them more responsive to initiating changes which would simply give them more responsibilities. On the other hand, they may be more responsive than college faculties to the areas of early childhood education, vocational education and exceptional education. They respond to their perceptions of the public will, rather than to the needs of college youth.

State department personnel also tend to be more responsive to

public school administrators than to teachers' organizations. If they had the major voice in teacher education there would, in most states, be an increase in the use of the productivity model (i.e. input/output, fiscal and learning accountability) with an emphasis on the competency based approaches. Quotas would be established and administered on the basis of various needs for teachers with particular specialization in the state. College faculty, ^{classroom} teachers and ^{school} administrators would probably be dealt with in a tripartite agreement, as per the State of Washington experience.

Teacher Controlled Teacher Education

The first job is to interest classroom teachers in becoming involved in the decision-making processes related to teacher education. At present, many classroom teachers are concerned with policies and practices related to student teaching; few have had the opportunity to gain the perspective needed to broaden their concerns to the total teacher education program.

At an organizational level, leaders of teacher associations are becoming increasingly active. On a local level, student teaching centers, fees to cooperating teachers, placement of student teachers and quotas are typical concerns. Uppermost, of course, is the organized effort at gaining input (control?) of the approved program machinery that now exists as a private prerogative of university faculty. The "predictions" which follow are based on teacher control meaning "teacher organizations" rather than generalizations of how teachers might respond as individuals.

The primary influence of teacher controlled teacher education would be to make programs more immediately applicable. Some specific demands now made by teachers' groups would be illustrative of the anticipated trend:

1. More specific methods of dealing with disruptive pupils; specific techniques for teaching reading and dealing with slow learners in basic skill areas.
2. Use of classroom teachers, or experts selected by classroom teachers, as the instructors needed to achieve #1 above; the offering of classes in schools rather than on campuses, whenever possible.
3. Give classroom teachers greater inputs into decisions related to a) who shall serve as cooperating teachers; b) which students they work with during student teaching, and under what conditions (e.g. time requirements, purposes of the experience, duties to be performed, etc.); c)grading practices; of d)selection/and practices of the college supervisor(e.g.number of school visits, bases of evaluation); e)payment for cooperating teachers):

*Note: In regard to #e above, it has been widely advocated that tuition now paid for student teaching now go to cooperating public school faculty rather than to institutions.
4. Permit future teachers to enter programs in areas where there is a need (as "need" is perceived by classroom teachers), particularly in the areas of exceptional education, so that there are more professionals to handle classroom problems. Restrict or close admission to teacher education programs in areas where jobs are scarce. Decision-making in this area of entrance into training programs (now reserved exclusively to college faculty and the students themselves), would become hard positions passed by local and state teachers' organizations.
5. Future teachers need more direct training in getting along with parents and students from various cultural backgrounds; this includes supervised, direct interaction with people of various backgrounds, not simply coursework.
6. Prepare future teachers who will work in and support teachers' organizations.

7. Get insurance coverage for cooperating teachers so that cooperating personnel can be fully relieved while students are in charge; this would enable cooperating personnel to do other things or take a break and would be perceived as a real benefit for having a student.
8. In some urban associations, but not nationally, student teaching will become an apprenticeship situation comparable to the building trades. Teachers with seniority will be able to get student teaching slots for their relatives. Outsiders will be excluded. Apprentices will move up substitutes and finally regulars.
9. Screen out hippies, radicals and other students perceived as disruptors. Select students who will improve present forms of schooling before they seek alternatives or promote change. Married women and others perceived as stable (emotionally and in life-style) will be given preference.
10. Deemphasize general education and in-depth college specialization. College courses that do not relate directly to practice will be significantly undervalued. The assumption that professional education derives from sound liberal education will be seriously questioned. Unlike the period of post WWI., the normal school position will not lose to the college argument, but will emerge triumphant --easily.
11. Teacher education will be clearly teacher training and even more specifically, on-the-job training on a school building level; that is, learning to follow the reading program used in the particular student teaching placement rather than learning to teach reading in general, or as advocated by some national authority. Another example would be learning to plan in the way the particular school requires, rather than learning some general principles of planning. Teachers are not simply interested

in learning new, or even precise techniques, but in gaining the exact techniques they need on a daily basis.

The NEA position on teacher education is as follows:

The National Education Association believes that teachers and students preparing to teach must be directly involved in evaluating and improving the standards for teacher preparation and certification. The Association insists that teacher involvement is necessary in planning and implementing quality teacher education programs. The Association also believes that preprofessional practicum experiences are an essential phase of teacher preparation. The responsibility for the practicum experience must be shared by the public schools, the institutions that prepare teachers and professional associations.

The Association urges its affiliates to -

- a) Take immediate steps to evaluate and improve standards for entrance into the teaching profession. (See #3, #4, and #9 above.)
- b) Support inclusion of training in the dynamics of intergroup communication and human relations courses in requirements for certification and the provision for inservice workshops in these areas for experienced teachers and administrators. (See #5 above.)
- c) Support legislation providing legal status and liability protection for student teachers. (See #7 above.)
- d) Develop guidelines for qualifications of cooperating teachers and college coordinators of student teaching. (See #3 above.)
- e) Support inclusion of instruction in the values, ethics, responsibilities and structure of professional teacher associations. (See #6 above.)
- f) Support the teaching of methods courses by teachers currently employed in elementary and secondary schools. (See #2 above.)
- g) Formulate standards for school systems receiving student teachers. (See #4 above.)
- h) Take immediate steps to improve the selection of persons entering the profession through more effective screening of applicants for the pre-professional practicum. (See #3.b.#8, #10, #11.)¹

Obviously, the most important portion of this document is paragraph one.

¹ National Education Association. NEA 1973 Handbook. Washington D.C.:1973.pp.77-78.

Since teacher education programs will not be scrapped in order to permit classroom teachers to become involved in planning and developing them, this paragraph implies involvement in the few new programs that may be developed, but much more importantly, involvement in the credentialing process that now oversees all programs so that teachers may have a real voice in all forms of existing teacher education.

Implications

No single constituency should control teacher education. This principle, if applied, is a greater criticism of the existing condition which permits unilateral decision-making by schools of education (with the "concurrence" of state departments and cooperating schools and associations), than a warning against what is likely to happen in future. Teacher education under the control of a single constituency would permit some highly desirable changes but also some severe repressions and dislocations.

My own position is that classroom teachers are not sufficiently represented now in the processes of offering and evaluating programs, in certifying graduates, or in accrediting programs. It seems to me that "giving" classroom teachers more responsibility is naïve; they can and will begin to "take" such responsibility. The real issue is the development of cooperative organizational machinery which will begin to swing the almost singular control by school of education faculty into a position that is more responsive to the practitioner. This not only would make teacher education similar to many of the other professions,

but more professional in the ideal sense. The mistakes of^{overly} narrow practicality, which can be expected to result from greater teacher control, are more easily rectified and^{are} therefore preferable, to the mistakes of irrelevance and duplication, which characterize much of faculty controlled teacher education.

Responsible professional education demands that we begin to view teacher education as accountable to classroom teachers as well as to the public. In answering the question, Accountable to whom? teacher educators have too often in the past responded with "to the student and those who pay his tuition," "to children and youth," or "to the public" and completely neglected the primary group that most completely represents the quality of our programs.

There needs to be a shift in the decision-making powers related to teacher education programming which will provide a balance between three basic constituencies: schools of education, public schools and teachers' organizations. All other groups directly or indirectly touched by teacher education are entitled to the right of consuming educational education services, but can neither be accountable or responsible for the planning, offering and evaluation of these services.